

grant an injunction to stay proceedings in a State court except as expressly authorized by Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments.” 28 U.S.C. § 2283 (emphasis added). The Plaintiff has pointed to no exception that would permit this Court to enjoin the superior court proceeding. By remanding the case, this Court declined to continue exercising jurisdiction. Nor is an injunction necessary to effectuate the remand order; its sole purpose was to send the case back to the superior court.

A writ of prohibition is likewise not an appropriate remedy. The All Writs Act “empowers a federal court-*in a case in which it is already exercising subject matter jurisdiction*-to enter such orders as are necessary to aid it in the exercise of such jurisdiction.” *In re Hill*, 437 F.3d 1080, 1083 (11th Cir. 2006) (emphasis added). See also 28 U.S.C. § 1651. As noted above, the Court declined to exercise jurisdiction over the Plaintiff’s state law claims. Further, it would be improper for this Court to issue a writ of prohibition to the Superior Court of Hancock County, which is not a subordinate court. See *Siler v. Storey*, 587 F. Supp. 986, 987 (N.D. Tex. 1984).

For the foregoing reasons, the Plaintiff’s petition is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED, this 21st day of April, 2014.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT